Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)	
10/712,795	CROOKE ET AL.	
Examiner	Art Unit	
Janet L. Epps-Ford	1633	

	Janet L. Epps-Ford	1000		
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence add	ress	
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 April 2008</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS AP	PLICATION IN CONDITION FOR A	LLOWANCE.		
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or o application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Application for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 periods:	n the same day as filing a Notice of a greplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi peal (with appeal fee) in compliance	Appeal. To avoid abar t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request	
a) The period for reply expires <u>3</u> months from the mailing dat	e of the final rejection.			
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing	g date of the final rejection	n.	
Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07		: FIRST REPLY WAS FIL	-ED MILHIN IAAC	
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of eunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office late may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b) NOTICE OF APPEAL	xtension and the corresponding amount shortened statutory period for reply origi or than three months after the mailing dat	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as	
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in com	nliance with 37 CEP 41 37 must be	filed within two months	of the date of	
filing the Notice of Appeal was filed on A blief in com- filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exte Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed v AMENDMENTS	ension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the		
 The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, (a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further co (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE beleaction) 	onsideration and/or search (see NO¯ ow);	ΓE below);		
(c) Managed They are not deemed to place the application in be	etter form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for	
appeal; and/or (d)⊠ They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally reje	ected claims		
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.		oted ciaims.		
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.	,	mnliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324)	
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s		mphane / internament (i	102 024).	
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a	· ———	timely filed amendmer	nt canceling the	
non-allowable claim(s). 7.	M will not be entered or b) M will	l be entered and an a	unlanation of	
7. ☑ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☑ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:				
Claim(s) allowed: <u>142-145, 197-212, 225, 227-235, 239-</u> Claim(s) objected to: <u>125,126,129-141,221-224,226 and</u>				
Claim(s) objected to: <u>123,128,129-141,221-224,228 and</u> Claim(s) rejected: <u>127,128 and 216-220</u> , for the reasons				
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:				
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, b because applicant failed to provide a showing of good ar was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 				
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessa 	overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	al and/or appellant fails	s to provide a	
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the consideration of the	on of the status of the claims after e	ntry is below or attach	ed.	
11. The request for reconsideration has been considered b	ut does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	oo boosuso:	
The request for reconsideration has been considered b	ut does NOT place the application if	Condition for alloware	de pedause.	
12. ☑ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s).13. ☑ Other: <u>See attached PTO-892</u>.	(PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). <u>4/08/200</u>	<u>08</u>		
	/Janet L. Epps-Ford/ Primary Examiner, Art U	Init 1633		
	, — · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicants have amended claim 216 to recite "an antisense oligonucleotide 20 nucleobases in length comprising at least 13 contiguous nucleobases of SEQ IDNO: 247, or a salt form thereof." Moreover, Applicants have added new claim 241 which depends from amended claim 216, wherein the antisense oligonucleotide is fully complementary to SEQ ID NO: 3. The newly added limitations, especially as set forth in claim 241 have not been previously considered in the context of newly amended claim 216. Moreover, Applicants have added new claims 242-246. Furthermore, Applicant's amendment to claim 216 would potentially neccesitate a new grounds of rejection, for example under 102 as anticipated by WO 9413794 A1, which discloses a nucleic acid primer of 20 bases pairs in length and comprises a 13 base pair contiguous sequence of SEQ ID NO: 247.

Although Applicants argue that a new search would not be necessitated in response to Applicant's amendment to the claims, it is clear that the nucleic acid databases at the USPTO grow on a daily basis, therefore any amendment that would change the scope of the claims (even narrowing) would necessitate and updated search. Moreover, with the publication of pre-grant patent applications, there is also the possibility of a US patent application having an earlier priorrity date than the instant application becoming publically available, and potentially reading on the amended claims. Therefore an updated search is considered necessary in the instant case.

Moreover, Applicants arguments appear to be directed the claims as set forth in the amendment filed 4/08/2008. Since this amendment was not entered, Applicant's arguments are considered moot, and the status of the claims remains as set forth in the prior Office Action.